

1 would be more clearly understood and that each individual
2 member of the legislature would be more clearly accountable
3 to his constituents in a unicameral body.

4 We have not heard refutation of this argument.

5 We have suggested that a unicameral body could
6 increase the prestige of the legislature and thereby tend
7 to attract more able citizens to its service. We have
8 not heard discussion of this point.

9 What we have heard is that bicameralism is
10 traditional and we are willing to concede that bicameralism
11 is traditional. We have heard that bicameralism somehow
12 prevents hasty legislation. But we repeat the argument
13 and the facts, which we pointed out in the Minority
14 report, that indeed hasty legislation is encouraged in the
15 second house by bicameralism because if it
16 is given effective and decent consideration in the first
17 house, it can't get to the second house until it is too late
18 to give it careful and deliberate consideration.

19 We have pointed out that more bills die, 80
20 percent of all bills die in the house of their origin, the
21 house of origin does a much better job of weeding out bad